



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



the whole life of society, are inevitably suggested as soon as one begins to reflect. Now it is a popular belief that both scholars and teachers are too much detached from real life, too wholly absorbed in ideas, too remote from practical, material things; that their endeavor needs to be humanized by contact with the factory, the store, the market-place, the stock exchange. Whether this be true or not, I shall not stop to consider. It seems to me, however, to be but an individual case of the universal problem of the adjustment, in every attempt at a well ordered life, of the claims of the material world, the intellectual, the moral life, and the life of nature. One aspect of this is briefly touched in Wordsworth's sonnet "The world is too much with us," another in the lines of Longfellow's *Morituri Salutamus*:

The scholar and the world! The endless strife,  
The discord in the harmonies of life!  
The love of learning, the sequestered nooks,  
And all the sweet serenity of books;  
The market-place, the eager love of gain,  
Whose aim is vanity, whose end is pain!

There is, however, another aspect of the matter that the spirit of the times forces upon our attention. At such a time as this, when social ideals are taking on such new forms, when social effort is assuming so many new activities, when educational ideals seem to have suffered such radical changes, and the air is full of philosophical and pedagogical cries of "Lo here!" "Lo, there!", one who is actively engaged in the work of education is impelled to look beyond his own field, to make inquiry concerning his own relation to all this change, his own position in all this turmoil, his own contribution to the activities with which he is most closely bound, the relation of these activities to

the social strivings of the times. It is with some such feeling as this that I have grouped together the thoughts that I have to bring before you at this time.

He who, in these days, attempts to say anything on a general educational subject must realize very vividly the hazardous nature of the undertaking. What is old has been effectively and eloquently said by the masters of thought all the way back to Plato; what appears to be new may be but unrecognized forms of the old, or it may be but the unmatured thought of one striving to meet the demands of conditions merely temporary. Then, too, we all live in the midst of educational controversy, and this is not conducive to a well-balanced, judicial presentation of matters, or to moderation of statement. Again, the field is so large and the interrelations so intricate that all general statements, even the most innocent, may be made to appear rather ridiculous when applied literally to special or exceptional details.

I shall attempt no definition of education, no exhaustive analysis of its elements, its aims, and purposes. I wish simply to call attention to some of its ideals, some of its present tendencies, and to set forth some considerations relating to that part of the field with which we are most vitally concerned. What I shall have to say applies particularly to college education, although the main considerations, will, I believe, hold true of the other stages.

In the first place, then, education is ideal. Not only is its chief concern with ideas, even when it touches material things, but its endeavor is towards better things, to freedom of human activity, the amelioration of life and its enrichment, the enlargement of intellectual and spiritual horizons, the broadening of sympathies. Its function is perpetually to awaken new desires, and to readjust its

methods to fit men the better to accomplish those desires. It reaches back into the past farther and farther to gather the riches of human experience, and ever reaches forward into the future, even to the

one far off divine event,  
To which the whole creation moves.

Secondly, education is preëminently social. It is a part of the great coöperative effort that civilization makes to bring its gains to the enrichment of individual life and experience, and to train the individual to live happily and effectively in society, or as Milton puts it, “to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war.”

In the third place, formal education, or education by personal instruction, is a limited affair, limited by time and, for most men, by the necessities best indicated, perhaps, by the phrase “making a living.” We can not, apparently, under present conditions, increase the amount of time ordinarily given to it. In fact, in recent years, it has been urged that we may with advantage shorten it. We can, to be sure, increase the efficiency of work done in this limited time, and one of the great efforts of modern education is to do this. The number of subjects taught may be increased, but the time given to each must thereby be diminished. We can introduce new subjects only by lessening the time given to the old, or by crowding out the old entirely. The share of the individual student in the enrichment of the curriculum can, from the necessity of the case, be but a relatively small amount. If you add typewriting, you must subtract something else; commercial law will probably crowd out English literature; and everything seems at present destined to crowd out languages.

In this matter, attention has been, in recent years, concentrated upon apparent gains; too little thought has been given to inevitable losses. It has been too often assumed by the promoters of new subjects that everything new is an addition, not a substitution. And strangely enough the question of choice seems to be considered less important as the field of choice grows larger.

Education, then, under present conditions, is, at best, but a selection of those subjects which are adapted to attain a desired result, a result that must be but a *partial* (not a complete) realization of the ideal training. Choice, then, there must be, choice among all the subjects of human knowledge of those whose educational value is highest; and the determination of educational value will be controlled by the ideal of education held. Now, I am well aware that the ideals and aims of education are so many and so complex that it is dangerous here to deal with simple quantities, with general statements; nevertheless, I believe that we can recognize rather clearly in the public mind at present two ideals, which differ mainly in regard to the emphasis put upon vital considerations. One of these ideals puts *first* the consideration, how to get a living; the other puts *first* the consideration, how to live in human society. The first trains for special efficiency in the world's work,—in providing for human wants, subduing nature, organizing and administering government. To this training it adds as much as may be of that which enriches human thought and feeling. The second trains for the clear head, the open mind, sensitive feelings, vivid imagination, strong will, and adds to this as much as may be of special training for getting a living. The first regards chiefly human activities; the second, human powers. I believe most firmly that the second of these ideals is the

truer. I do not wish now to consider systematically the grounds for such belief, but rather to lay emphasis on certain aspects of human life and character, to indicate their bearing upon educational ideals, and, if possible, to suggest some of the relations that our special field of endeavor sustains to the greater whole of educational life.

Now, in all these matters, the farther we get away from details, from the consideration of detached subjects, from institutions, programs, methods, devices, the closer do we get to matters involving the philosophy of life. For education is but a part of life, but a shaping and coloring of life, but a preparation for a part of life, but a help to the attainment of human desires. From the wide range of human desires I have taken one for consideration; it is not the highest, nor by any means the lowest. Its consideration may not involve the deepest moral issues, but it does, I believe, involve issues more important and wide-reaching than at first sight appear.

I pass now to consider the subject of leisure. To some pious minds, no doubt, the word suggests the old rhyme

Satan finds some mischief still  
For idle hands to do;

to others it suggests Hogarth's Idle Apprentice, Carlyle's corn-lawing, game-preserving aristocrat, or automobiles, yachts, golf, endless trips abroad and country houses at home. Without attempting to ring all the changes on the meaning of the word, I note as some of the ideas that it signifies the following: time to be idle, time for rest, freedom from labor and routine work, time to do one's appointed work well, time and freedom to do the work one desires. The idea common to all these conceptions is freedom. In the third chapter of Genesis labor is a curse

imposed for sin, and civilization has always felt as a burden the providing for the wants of the body, food, clothing, shelter. Individuals have avoided this burden by shifting it to the backs of others; one class has imposed its share of the burden upon another.—But I have said enough to suggest to you the mighty problem whose solution grips the modern world. In these days every thoughtful man carries, at least in the background of his consciousness, the woe, the evil, the misery of exploited and oppressed labor. Contemporary literature is full of it; politics is slowly becoming aware of it as the issue that transcends all others. Here, then, is a case where leisure is a matter of momentous consequence. Unequal distribution of the world's work brings unequal distribution of wealth, and what is more important, unequal distribution of leisure, which is freedom.

Carlyle's *Gospel of Work*, the doctrine of the dignity of labor, the ideal of the strenuous life, the enormous modern development of industrial and commercial activity,—these and many other influences have led to a glorification of human activity without consideration of the ends of this activity and the cost of it in things more precious. We have developed an unreasoning admiration for the glutton of work, particularly if the results of the work are material and tangible. So glorious do the Sons of Martha appear, so honored are they, that the Sons of Mary may be forgiven if they often doubt the wisdom of their choice. Would it not be well for us sometimes to turn from the glories of material achievement and contemplate the burdensome nightmare of labor with which the modern world is obsessed, the worthlessness, the evil, the futility of much of it, the price that is paid for it in human life and happiness?

That there is a sanatory power in routine activity which keeps one from the rot of idleness and evil; that labor, like the voice of duty, frees us from "the weight of chance-desires," is, of course, true; but it is just as true that the burden of routine labor may check or suppress the growth of precious gifts of mind and soul, hamper beneficent activities, or destroy innocent happiness; biography and fiction are eloquent witnesses to all this. Persons whose self-control is weak and whose intellectual resources are limited may rightly feel that for them contentment and salvation lie only in the daily round of toil; and multitudes become so stunted, and cramped, and narrowed that for them a sudden acquisition of much leisure means moral destruction. But all this is the result of human weakness and error, not evidence of strength and freedom. The world's work must be done; its burden is not to be escaped; food, clothing, shelter are imperatives that will not be denied. But it is universally recognized that this should absorb but a small part of human energy and endeavor, and we are making great efforts to equalize this burden. It is estimated (is it not?) that somewhat less than three hours a day for each individual is all that is required. Our socialist friends hold out \$2,000 a. year and a six hour day as a present attainable average. What of the surplus time? As it grows larger does not its use become a matter of grave concern, as well as a vision of glorious hope?

We may turn now to less serious aspects of the matter. The longing for leisure is deep-seated and universal. This is shown by the great efforts made to shorten the time that must be devoted to labor. Restrictive labor laws, eight-hour days, early closing, week-end recesses, fixed vacations, leaves of absence,—these are but a few of the things that

show the desire to increase the leisure of the modern world. Further, all ideals of ameliorated society provide not only for freedom from grinding toil and evil environment, but also for time and freedom for rational enjoyment, in intellectual and emotional activity. The golden age, Utopia, the Earthly Paradise, yes, the Heavenly Paradise,—all embody this longing for freedom to enjoy. This desire for leisure is a worthy and noble desire; in it is involved the striving for higher things, the longing for fuller and richer experience, the rising to higher levels of living. Another witness to the great value of leisure is the high esteem in which we hold what we now have of it. The clerk looks forward all day to closing time, he looks forward all the year to his weeks of vacation; the hours of evening, his holidays, his vacations are to him the great joy of life. The teacher, however faithful and devoted to work, cherishes the precious hours of quiet reading, the days of relaxation, the weeks of vacation that bring widening of experience and broader human touch. Here as elsewhere, when freedom is involved, self-control is the determining factor; want of it may turn leisure into the dregs of life, the wise exercise of it makes of leisure the cream of life.

But there is another view of leisure, which presents it, not as freedom from work, but rather as freedom to do work well, or freedom to do the work one desires; and this, I take it, is the leisure we most long for. Urgent as may be our desire for rest, for relaxation, for idleness, stronger than this is our longing for time and freedom to do well what we have to do, time and opportunity to increase our knowledge of what we have to teach, to enrich the intellectual and human background against which we must project what we teach. Then, too, many of us, I am sure, chose our profession, not

primarily because we wished to teach, but because teaching would secure for us leisure to study and investigate. We believe that we have foregone much to gain this leisure, and some of us no doubt have also by stress of circumstances, academic and other, foregone the leisure. Be that as it may, leisure for study is at present the strongest attraction to the profession of academic teaching.

And this brings us round to the question, What account does our modern education take of leisure? One is tempted to say that, in these days, it takes almost no account of it. Underpaid and overworked teachers, hurried into the profession, some in two years, others in four, hurried out again by marriage or a better salaried calling; hasty, superficial instruction in a large number of subjects with no accurate knowledge of any; constant pressure to shorten the time for education; incessant demand for instruction that will bring immediate results in the pay-envelope; the multiplication of distracting athletic and social activities in colleges and universities, encouraged by faculties and aggravated by co-education; ingenious get-degree-quick devices, resulting in dazzling intellectual patchwork,—how far all this from quiet, from leisure, from simple human dignity.

During the last twenty-five years the American educational world has been deafened with the clamor arising from the callings interested in the material side of life. The business man, the manufacturer, the builder, the farmer, the housewife, have all been crying out for better service from those who are to help them do the world's work. "Greater efficiency" is the cry, and all have looked to the instruments of public education to remedy the defect, to furnish forthwith to each calling men well trained and *especially* trained for all departments of its work; not only the

master-builder, but the bricklayer; not only the consulting engineer, but the handy-man; not only the business administrator, but the advertiser and the bookkeeper. It is no wonder that an educational system whose main purpose had been intellectual and spiritual culture directed to social ends, has been thrown into confusion and bewilderment and brought sadly out of balance. No wonder, too, that it has caught the spirit of the business and industrial world, its desire for great things—large enrollment, great equipment, puffed advertisement, sensational features, strenuous competition, underbidding. Our state universities are ever vaunting their material service that may be measured in dollars, in bushels, in pounds. Even our specialists in public hygiene are said to have too much thought for the material economic gain of health preserved and life saved. Peace and quiet seem to have departed from academic halls; meditation, "the sweet serenity of books" seem to grow rarer and rarer; in the groves of Academe roost unquietly the "tame villatic fowl" of poultry husbandry. More than one gentle soul in a moment of irritation has sighed for the seclusion of the medieval monastery.

I fear that I have used a rather extravagant form of statement; of course, not all of the particulars hold good everywhere; probably no one system or institution shows them all; but that all can be found somewhere,—of that fact I am sure. I leave it to you to supply the necessary modifications and corrections from your own personal experience, and pass on to consider leisure as related to teachers, to students, to the material of academic instruction.

Concerning the leisure of teachers, I have not much to say. The investigation recently undertaken by this Asso-

ciation concerning the teaching of English composition has shown, with rather startling vividness, the utter futility of educational effort under cramping restrictions of time. Here surely is a condition to which justly may be applied Carlyle's phrase, an "insupportable approximation to perfection." Out of it all arises a cry, not for more holidays, longer vacations, more time for rest, but for more time, more leisure to do work well enough to preserve personal and professional self-respect. Who believes that this is the only spot in the educational system where can be found this lamentable waste of money and human energy, arising from want of leisure?

In colleges and universities, it is true, the burden of actual hours of class-room instruction has, in recent years, been lightened, but the distractions of academic life, especially in our larger institutions, have been greatly increased. The long list of committees in every university catalogue is an eloquent witness to faulty activity in administration and legislation. The high salaried professor doing clerk's work is a spectacle that has not entirely ceased out of the land. The demand for closer personal touch with students and the regulation of their activities is absorbing more and more of the margin of leisure. Here, too, as elsewhere, the educational system is bearing burdens that belong to parents and to the state. If the boy who has never been restrained at home comes to grief in college, the faculty is generally held responsible; does it not stand *in loco parentis*? In place, too, not of the ordinary parent but of the ideal parent. The state or the municipality may leave wide open the saloons, gambling houses, and brothels of a university town; the faculty seems to be held wholly responsible if youth get into such places.

The matter of student leisure is difficult to deal with.

One of my colleagues, summing up the current criticisms of college life, says: "The arraignment is long and severe; students have no intellectual interests, no appreciation, no knowledge of essentials, no ability to apply what they assimilate; they are flabby, they dawdle, they fritter and frivol, they condemn the grind, they miseducate the studious, they seek proficiency in stunts, they drift to the soft and circumvent the hard; undertrained and overtaught, they are coddled and spoon-fed and served where they should be serving; and they get their degree for a quality of work which in an office would cost them their jobs." If only a small part of this were true, it would appear that students do not, at present, stand in need of more leisure. Indeed, some would maintain that the best way to correct present evils is to prescribe more and more work. True it is, that the right use of leisure demands self-control, and the present system develops very little intellectual self-control or initiative; and this, perhaps, is its greatest weakness. Freedom of election, some of whose results are good and others exceedingly pernicious, is still a subject of warm controversy, but is there not another freedom as important as the freedom of election, namely, freedom to engage, to some extent, in intellectual self-culture in an environment that might be most stimulating for that pursuit? Is it not of supreme importance that the college graduate shall carry away with him the desire and the power to continue independently the culture that the college has begun? And how may this be better accomplished than by giving freedom and encouragement for such independent work while he is in college? I look back with great delight to the days of my senior year at Williams College. There was required of us, in class-room work, but two-thirds of the amount required in the other years;

beyond this we were free. Now I have never been able to persuade myself that this freedom was a bad thing for me or for my classmates. We did a lot of miscellaneous reading and some thinking,—I will admit a little loafing to keep the picture human; but leisure did not corrupt us,—we had some joy in intellectual pursuits. I am aware, of course, that it happened in the good old days, with the good old boys, in an environment about perfect. Perhaps anything like it would be impossible today. We have come to associate the academic *intellectual* life with requiring, driving, crediting; leisure seems wholly foreign to it, suggesting rather diversions, distractions, amusements, student activities. What our students need, is a greater amount of *intellectual* leisure; how to secure it to them is a problem of very great difficulty, too complex for discussion here.

But more important than leisure for professors or students is the subject of the relation of academic education to the leisure of after life. In an earlier part of this discourse I tried to show that leisure may be, in the natural order of things, the most important part of life, the happiest and richest in human development. If this be true, then it should be a very important function of education to train for a wise and noble use of leisure.

In these days, educational effort strains every nerve to prepare the student for his calling, and to set him at work in that calling at the earliest possible moment. Whatever does not tend directly to this practical end is ruthlessly cut out of his program. By this method hundreds of graduates are sent forth every year without intellectual and emotional resources apart from their professional training. It must be admitted that most graduates will, under present conditions, have lives of strenuous activity; but

what about the intellectual and spiritual background of those lives, the interests non-professional, the time of civic and social activity, the hours of leisure? Shall education take no account of all this? Shall it give all thought to efficiency, to service, to tangible material success, and little or no thought to that precious part of life in which body, mind, and spirit live in individual freedom? It cannot neglect this, if our civilization is to be increasingly rich with human interest, sympathy, and happiness. In this connection some stanzas from a poem of Browning's entitled *Shop* are suggestive.

Because a man has shop to mind  
In time and place, since flesh must live,  
Needs spirit lack all life behind,  
All stray thoughts, fancies fugitive,  
All loves except what trade can give?

I want to know a butcher paints,  
A baker rhymes for his pursuit,  
Candlestick-maker much acquaints  
His soul with song, or, haply mute,  
Blows out his brains upon the flute.

This matter, too, has an important bearing upon social intercourse. To be pleasant and profitable, social intercourse must be based upon common experience, common sympathies, common knowledge, common intellectual interests. Modern education with its increasing specialization seems more and more to narrow the amount of common intellectual interest. Where this is the case, men meet on a lower plane, and social intercourse is apt to become flat and unprofitable, to degenerate into mere eating, drinking, and anecdoting, perhaps down on the common ground suggested by Heine's lines:

Selten habt ihr mich verstanden,  
Selten auch verstand ich euch;  
Nur wenn wir im Koth uns fanden  
So verstanden wir uns gleich.

It is seriously urged nowadays that we should give up reading the classics of literature because so few people can talk about them. You are advised to give up your Milton and Dante, your Goethe and Molière, your Vergil and Homer, perhaps even your Bible, and to devote your time to the perusal of the "best-sellers," if you wish to promote social intercourse.

Now the question inevitably presents itself, What group of subjects is best adapted to furnish the common intellectual interest, and at the same time to supply the needs of that part of life which I have called leisure? Here, as everywhere, there is difference of opinion, but the general answer is, the humanities; and of the humanities the chief is literature, ancient and modern. Here is opened up a field of discussion too wide to be entered into, but I must give myself the pleasure of quoting these words of Woodrow Wilson:

"It is so with all essential literature. It has a quality to move you, and you can never mistake it, if you have any blood in you. And it has always a power to instruct you which is as effective as it is subtle, and which no research or systematic method can ever rival. 'Tis a sore pity if that power cannot be made available in the classroom. It is not merely that it quickens your thought and fills your imagination with the images that have illuminated the choicer minds of the race. It does indeed exercise the faculties in this wise, bringing them into the best atmosphere, and into the presence of the men of greatest charm and force; but it does a great deal more than that. It acquaints the mind, by direct contact, with the forces which really govern and modify the world from generation to generation. There is more of a

nation's politics to be got out of its poetry than out of all its systematic writers upon public affairs and constitutions. Epics are better mirrors of manners than chronicles; dramas oftentimes let you into the secrets of statutes; orations stirred by a deep energy of emotion or resolution, passionate pamphlets that survive their mission because of the direct action of their style along permanent lines of thought, contain more history than parliamentary journals. It is not knowledge that moves the world, but ideals, convictions, the opinions or fancies that have been held or followed; and whoever studies humanity ought to study it alive, practice the vivisection of reading literature, and acquaint himself with something more than anatomies which are no longer in use by spirits."

This, then, is the academic field in which *our* work lies, and I conclude by calling attention to some of the present conditions and our relation to the rest of the academic world.

Modern language departments are burdened with a very large amount of elementary teaching of students who pursue the work but one or two years. This is due partly to the broadening of entrance requirements, which has increased elementary work in almost all departments, partly to the demand for language for practical purposes,—that Spanish which leads not to the treasures of Spanish literature, but which holds out the remote chance of leading to the treasures of Mexico or Argentina; that German which leads not to Goethe and Schiller, but to *Zeitschriften* and *Beiträge*; just that amount of English which will keep one from writing "the letter that lost the job."

Milton in his tractate *On Education* says, "And though

a linguist should pride himself to have all the tongues that Babel cleft the world into, yet if he have not studied the solid things in them, as well as the words and lexicons, he were nothing so much to be esteemed a learned man as any yeoman or tradesman competently wise in the mother dialect only." It should be our chief function, as it is our chief delight, to teach the "solid things" of the literature of modern languages. Philology, history of literature, training of teachers, training of researchers, language for technical workers,—all these are important, and should not in the least be neglected, but I would insist that the highest function, and the chief function of every department of language and literature is to bring to all undergraduates the delight and inspiration of great literature.

Every department of a college or university will make its impression upon the student body by the character of the men on its staff; the professor of geology, of Sanskrit, of hydrodynamics, may be the man of widest personal influence. Nevertheless, there are departments whose influence will be restricted mainly to those students who work in them; for example, mathematics, physics, mineralogy, comparative philology. On the other hand, there are departments whose influence should be felt in the intellectual life of the whole student community; such departments are philosophy, sociology, history, literature, fine arts, music. These departments have a mission not confined to the students in their classes; it is their function to determine the tone and temper of the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere in which the university world lives. The present tone of college life is a matter of grave concern in many places, and great effort is made to improve it indirectly by the encouragement, direction, and regulation of student activities, and such-like things. Would it not

be better to give up such attempts and strive to improve it directly by means of the subjects of academic instruction?

In the recent past, subjects whose aims are primarily ideal, not practical and material, have been placed at a serious disadvantage in the estimation of educational values and in the warm controversy over educational aims. But this, I believe, has not been due wholly to the nature of the subjects themselves; it has, in some measure, been caused by the rather meek and hesitant attitude of those directly concerned with the teaching of them. Literature has for many years submitted too calmly to the militant power of new subjects "flown with insolence" from conquest of the educational field. It has been too diffident of its own powers and of the value of its ideals; its endeavor has often been half-hearted and vacillating, weakened by scepticism; its program has often been shapeless and changing, often without due regard to relative values; it has seen its hold upon men grow weaker and weaker, until in most co-educational institutions its classes run in the proportion of that of the

instructor named Noyes  
Who taught fifty girls and two boys.

If all this is to be changed, the result must be brought about in the academic world chiefly by a more zealous and aggressive effort on the part of those who have this subject deeply at heart and believe firmly in its ideals.

The college and university world seems at present to stand in need of a true revival of learning and of respect for learning, an awakening of intellectual curiosity, a stimulation of intellectual initiative, the inculcation of that high idealism which must ever be the chief glory of the educational institutions of a great nation. When all this

